

1 MARK J. CONNOT (10010)  
2 KEVIN M. SUTEHALL (9437)  
2 **FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**  
3 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, #700  
3 Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
4 Telephone: (702) 262-6899  
4 Facsimile: (702) 597-5503 fax  
5 mconnot@foxrothschild.com  
5 ksutehall@foxrothschild.com  
5 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
6 *Wells Fargo & Company, Wells Fargo Bank N.A.,*  
6 *and Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC*

7

8 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 In re

Case No. BK-N-15-50292-gwz

11 MARGARET LESLIE CANTLON, aka

Chapter 11

12 Cindy Cantlon, Mrs. William McKean Cantlon,

13 Debtor-in-Possession.

Adv. No. 18-05006-btb

14 MARGARET LESLIE CANTLON, aka  
15 Cindy Cantlon, Mrs. William McKean  
16 Cantlon and MARGARET LESLIE  
16 CANTLON, Trustee of the WILLIAM  
17 AND MARGARET CANTLON  
17 FAMILY TRUST dated March 7, 2000,

**STATUS REPORT REGARDING**  
**MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 WELLS FARGO & COMPANY,  
20 WELLS FARGO BANK N.A., and  
21 WELLS FARGO ADVISORS, LLC,

22 Defendants.

23 In accordance with the Court's directive on January 26, 2021, Defendants Wells Fargo &  
24 Company, Wells Fargo Bank N.A., and Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC (together, "Defendants" or  
25 "Wells Fargo") submit this status report concerning Defendants' motions to dismiss and  
26 supplemental authorities.

27

28

1       **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2           To convenience the Court, Wells Fargo summarizes this matter's nearly three-year  
 3 procedural history.

4       **A. Motions to Dismiss**

5           On March 7, 2018, Plaintiff Margaret Leslie Cantlon Aka Cindy Cantlon, Mrs. William  
 6 McKean Cantlon, and Margaret Leslie Cantlon as Trustee of the William and Margaret Cantlon  
 7 Family Trust Dated March 7, 2000 ("Plaintiff") filed her "Counterclaim/Complaint to Recover  
 8 Money Converted by Creditor, Wells Fargo" [AECF No. 1<sup>1</sup>] the ("Complaint"), initiating this  
 9 adversary proceeding. Wells Fargo filed its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint [AECF No.  
 10 8<sup>2</sup>] ("Motion to Dismiss Original Complaint") on April 3, 2018. The Motion to Dismiss Original  
 11 Complaint primarily argued that all of Plaintiff's claims were based on events that had occurred  
 12 more than six years before its March 2018 filing date and therefore were barred by the applicable  
 13 statutes of limitations. *Id.* Plaintiff filed her opposition to the Motion to Dismiss Original  
 14 Complaint on May 28, 2018 [AECF No. 14]. Wells Fargo filed its reply in support of the Motion  
 15 to Dismiss Original Complaint on June 5, 2018 [AECF No. 19].

16           The Court heard oral arguments on the Motion to Dismiss Original Complaint on  
 17 September 25, 2018. A transcript of the hearing was subsequently filed on October 1, 2018 [AECF  
 18 No. 29]. On October 24, 2018, the Court entered its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on  
 19 the Motion to Dismiss Original Complaint [AECF No. 33] and its Order Concerning the Motion  
 20 to Dismiss Original Complaint [AECF No. 34]. Based on its finding that Plaintiff's claims were  
 21 not pleaded in accordance with the governing standards, the Court dismissed all but one of  
 22 Plaintiff's claims without prejudice and granted Plaintiff leave to amend. *Id.* The Court dismissed  
 23 Plaintiff's claim for "Violation of Graham-Leach-Bliley" without leave to amend. *Id.* The Court  
 24 declined to rule on Wells Fargo's arguments that the statutes of limitations barred Plaintiff's

---

25           <sup>1</sup> Referenced herein to "AECF" are this adversary proceeding case number 18-05006.  
 26

27           <sup>2</sup> The First Motion to Dismiss was referred to in various filings as an Amended Motion to Dismiss.  
 28 AECF No. 8 was an amended version of the motion to address a technical issue with AECF No.  
 7.

1 claims, instead reserving such arguments for later. *Id.*

2 Plaintiff filed her “Amended Complaint to Recover Deposits Converted by Defendants and  
 3 Their Predecessors, Filed Pursuant to FRBP 7001(1)” on October 29, 2018 [AECF No. 36] (the  
 4 “Amended Complaint”). Wells Fargo filed its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint  
 5 on November 26, 2018 [AECF No. 37] (the “Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint”). Like its  
 6 predecessor, the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint was mostly based on the expiration of  
 7 the applicable statutes of limitations in addition to other arguments. *Id.* Plaintiff filed her  
 8 Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint on February 7, 2019 [AECF No. 43].  
 9 Wells Fargo filed its reply in support of the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint on February  
 10 14, 2019 [AECF No. 44].

11 The Court heard arguments on the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint on February  
 12 21, 2019, which was memorialized in a transcript filed on February 28, 2019 [AECF No. 46]. To  
 13 begin the hearing, the Court recited the materials that it had reviewed and then discussed each of  
 14 the claims that Plaintiff asserted in her Amended Complaint. *Id.* at pgs. 1-10. The Court then  
 15 noted that “it strikes me that there is no dispute regarding the length of the various statute of  
 16 limitations regarding any of the ten claims for relief, only that, one, there is no effective statute of  
 17 limitations against any bank as a result -- what was it, 11.19?” *Id.* at 12:5-12:9. (The statute at  
 18 issue was NRS 11.290.) The Court then discussed its analysis both of pleading standards and of  
 19 various authorities relating to turnover under 11 U.S.C. §542 and other issues and equitable tolling.  
 20 *Id.* at 12-25.

21 Following a short argument by Wells Fargo’s counsel (*id.* at 25:21-27:16), the Court  
 22 engaged in colloquy with Plaintiff’s counsel about 11 U.S.C. §108 and the statutes of limitations  
 23 governing Plaintiff claims. *Id.* at 27:21 *et seq.* The Court, with Plaintiff’s counsel’s agreement,  
 24 concluded that if the statute of limitations for any claim had expired prior to Plaintiff’s March 5,  
 25 2015 bankruptcy petition, it “would end” the analysis and that “filing bankruptcy does not breathe  
 26 new life into it.” *Id.* at 28:8-28:19. The Court then discussed statutes of limitations for claims that  
 27 had not expired before the date of the petition, in which case the statutes would expire two years  
 28

1 after the petition was filed (here, March 5, 2017) or by the expiration of the of an applicable state  
2 statute of limitations, whichever was later. *Id.* at 28:20-29:18.

3 At that point in the oral argument, the Court considered Plaintiff's assertion that "there's  
4 no statute of limitations in an action against a bank." *Id.* at 29:19-30:9. In perhaps the most critical  
5 admission and finding during the oral argument, Plaintiff's counsel agreed that the statutes of  
6 limitations discussed in Wells Fargo's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint would apply *but*  
7 *for* Plaintiff's assertions concerning NRS 11.290:

8 THE COURT: So therefore, you say that there's no --and if 11.290 is not  
9 applicable, then the applicable statute of limitations would be those that  
have been argued by Wells Fargo.

10 MR. CARTLIDGE: Yes, sir.

11 THE COURT: Okay. We agree on that.

12 *Id.* at 30:10-30:15. (Wells Fargo's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint had included, as  
13 Exhibit 1, a chart with the statutes of limitations for each of Plaintiff's claims and authority for  
14 each such period. AECF No. 37 at 23-24.)

15 The Court then asked Plaintiff's counsel about the application of NRS 11.290 to each of  
16 Plaintiff's causes of action. AECF No. 46 at 30:15-30:22. After a lengthy discussion in which  
17 Plaintiff's counsel (incorrectly) contended that a 1978 California Supreme Court entitled *Bullis v.*  
18 *Security National Bank* was binding on this Nevada bankruptcy court (*id.* at 30:23-34:4), the Court  
19 inquired of Plaintiff's counsel as follows:

20 THE COURT: So you're saying *Bullis* controls what I'm going to do here?

21 MR. CARTLIDGE: Yes, sir.

22 THE COURT: Okay. You want to certify to the Nevada Supreme Court?

23 *Id.* at 34:5-34:9. Additional colloquy between the Court and counsel followed, wherein the Court  
24 asserted that "I need to be able to accept your position regarding [NRS] 11.290 to be able to find  
25 in your favor and deny this motion to dismiss. I need to do that. That's how important this is to  
26 you. . . . I can't be any more clear than that." *Id.* at 41:16-41:21. To conclude the hearing, the  
27 Court elected to refer the question of "does 11.290 apply to any and all actions that may be brought  
28

1 against a bank for any reason?" to the Nevada Supreme Court, and stayed the adversary  
 2 proceedings until the Nevada Supreme Court issued a decision. *Id.* at 48:17-50:7. No written  
 3 order on the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint was entered except for the certifying question  
 4 to the Nevada Supreme Court, discussed immediately below.

5 **B. The Nevada Supreme Court Rules Against Plaintiff**

6 This Court entered an Amended Order Certifying Question to the Nevada Supreme Court  
 7 on April 4, 2019. AECF No. 53. The Nevada Supreme Court accepted the certified questions and  
 8 directed briefing on the issues in an order dated June 10, 2019. AECF No. 57. The parties  
 9 thereafter fully briefed the issues as ordered to the Nevada Supreme Court.

10 On November 20, 2020, the Nevada Supreme Court issued its decision on the certified  
 11 questions. AECF No. 60 at 6-10<sup>3</sup>. In its decision, after the statutes of limitations governing  
 12 specific state law claims that Plaintiff asserted in her Amended Complaint, the Nevada Supreme  
 13 Court stated that:

14 Given Cantlon's reading, NRS 11.290 would broadly and, purportedly,  
 15 infinitely extend the temporal limitations on all of her claims. And, in so  
 16 doing, the section would directly conflict with every specific statute of  
 17 limitation noted above. We deem it unlikely that NRS 11.290—a tersely  
 18 worded statute to which we have not had occasion to add significant legal  
 19 gloss since it was enacted in 1911—could rightly be read to have such  
 20 sweeping effect.

21 *Id.* at 9. At the end of its decision, the Nevada Supreme Court held that: "[i]n light of the specific  
 22 issues raised in the underlying bankruptcy matter, it is, in our view, sufficient that we limitedly  
 23 answer whether NRS 11.290 applies to any of the state law claims that Plaintiff asserted. Plainly,  
 24 it does not." *Id.* at 9. The Nevada Supreme Court thereafter denied Plaintiff's petition for a  
 25 rehearing. *Id.* at 4-5.

26 The Nevada Supreme Court denied, without exception, Plaintiff's argument that NRS  
 27 11.290 granted her a never-ending statute of limitations as to her state law claims. Nothing about  
 28 the Nevada Supreme Court's ruling affects the parties' arguments on the expiration of the

---

<sup>3</sup> The Nevada Supreme Court's unpublished decision is accessible on Westlaw at 2020 WL 6870490.

1 governing statute of limitations except to the extent it rejected Plaintiff's only potential case-saving  
 2 assertion. The Supreme Court's opinion simply eliminated Plaintiff's argument that her claims  
 3 were not barred by the governing the statutes of limitations based on NRS 11.290.

4 **II. WELLS FARGO POSITION CONCERNING MOTION TO DISMISS AMENDED  
 5 COMPLAINT**

6 During the status conference on January 26, 2021, the Court authorized the parties to  
 7 supplement arguments or points on the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint in this status  
 8 report. AECF No. 61 at 11:16-11:18 and 14:1-14:5. While Wells Fargo's counsel asserted that  
 9 further oral arguments were unnecessary, Plaintiff requested authorization to present additional  
 10 oral arguments, and the Court granted Plaintiff's request while ordering the parties to submit status  
 11 reports by February 16, 2021. *Id.* at 15:4-15:17. The Court indicated that its courtroom deputy  
 12 would thereafter send out a notice of oral argument to take place via telephonic hearing. *Id.* at  
 13 16:12-16:18.

14 Toward the end of the status conference, the Court limited the scope of supplemental  
 15 authorities to be submitted with their status reports, stating "I want to know if there's any  
 16 supplement *as a result of the order from the Nevada Supreme Court*. That's it. It shouldn't be all  
 17 that tough." *Id.* at 17:13-17:16 (emphasis added). Wells Fargo submits that no supplemental  
 18 authorities are even remotely necessary based on the Nevada Supreme Court's order. As described  
 19 above, the Nevada Supreme Court wholesale rejected Plaintiff's arguments with respect to NRS  
 20 11.290, holding that NRS 11.290 does not apply to any of Plaintiff's state law claims.

21 Wells Fargo submits that the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint is ripe for  
 22 adjudication consistent with the Court's prior ruling, oral and provision as it was. To reiterate,  
 23 Court ruled on the entirety of the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint when it advised Plaintiff  
 24 that "I need to be able to accept your position regarding [NRS] 11.290 to be able to find in your  
 25 favor and deny this motion to dismiss." AECF 46 at 41:16-41:21. No uncertainty or ambiguity  
 26 remains with respect to statutes of limitations, Plaintiff's section 542 turnover claim<sup>4</sup>, or anything

---

27 <sup>4</sup> The Court extensively reviewed and analyzed authorities relating to Plaintiff's defective  
 28 turnover claims during the February 21, 2019 hearing. AECF No. 46 at 10:17-23:22. While the

1 else. The Nevada Supreme Court rejected Plaintiff's position on NRS 11.290. Accordingly, per  
2 this Court's prior statements, the Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint should be granted in  
3 favor of Wells Fargo. Wells Fargo requests that the motion be granted and that Plaintiff not be  
4 given further leave to amend to assert clearly time-barred claims.

5 DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021.  
6

7 **FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP**  
8

9 /s/ Mark J. Connot  
10 MARK J. CONNOT (10010)  
11 KEVIN M. SUTEHALL (9437)  
12 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 700  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
*Attorneys for Defendants*  
Wells Fargo & Company, Wells Fargo Bank N.A.,  
and Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
Court did not ultimately rule on the validity of Plaintiff's section 542 turnover claim on February  
21, 2019, its analysis suggested that the claim could not survive.  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021, I served a copy of the foregoing **STATUS REPORT** through the Court's ECF System to the person(s) listed below.

John White, Esq.  
White Law Chartered  
335 West First Street  
Reno, NV 89503  
[john@whitelawchartered.com](mailto:john@whitelawchartered.com)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Blaine E. Cartlidge, Esq.  
Cartlidge Law Office  
5865 Tyrone Road, Suite 101  
Reno, NV 89502  
[cartlidge@icloud.com](mailto:cartlidge@icloud.com)

/s/ Doreen Loffredo  
An Employee of Fox Rothschild LLP